

TITLE VI ANNUAL UPDATE ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT, FY04

I. POLICY STATEMENT

WSDOT is currently revising its Title VI Plan, which, once released, will include a newly signed Title VI Policy and Assurances by the Secretary of Transportation. In addition to having the Secretary sign the 2004 version of the aforementioned document, the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity will brief the Secretary on the Title VI Program and its impact to the federal-aid highway process.

WSDOT expects to complete the revisions and make the document final on April 29, 2005. WSDOT Title VI compliance assurances are continuously published in WSDOT's environmental documents, invitations for public consultation forums and other official documents.

II. ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

A. Organization

WSDOT's Title VI Program continues to follow an interdisciplinary approach in its Title VI compliance monitoring and reporting activities. As described in previous submittals, Title VI Program Area Liaisons have been appointed to assist the Department's compliance efforts. There were several new appointments for the duties of Title VI Liaison for Education and Training, Construction, and Highway and Local Programs Division, during the reporting period. Additionally, Title VI Liaisons were temporarily designated for the Washington State Ferries (WSF) and the Maintenance Office during this year's compliance discussions. Please refer to the table below for the names and job titles of the new Title VI Liaisons.

B. STAFFING

Title VI Special Emphasis Programs Area Liaisons (see table below)

Name	Title	Program
Steve Chestnut	Hearing Coordinator	Design/Location
Fred Atkinson	Training Supervisor	Training
Ralph Wilhelmi	Regional Coordination Team Leader	Planning
Tom Hanson	Research Project Manager	Research
Shirley Hughes	Appraisal Manager	Right of Way
Ernest W. Combs	NEPA Specialist	Environmental Affairs
Karlene Loran	Contract Specialist	Consultant Contracts
Doug Pierce	Contracts	Maintenance
David Jones	Construction	Construction
David Mounts	Operations	Highway and Local Programs
Tim McGuigan	Contracts and Legal Services	Washington State Ferries

III. TITLE VI MONITORING AND REVIEW PROCESS

MPO and RTPO Title VI Compliance

During the FY04 reporting period, the Title VI Coordinator continued working with MPOs and RTPOs across the state to ensure they all have a functional Title VI Program in place. All of the planning organizations under WSDOT were advised of the Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency requirements FHWA and FTA communicated to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) after their most recent certification reviews.

Currently, the majority of the MPOs and RTPOs are reporting their federal highway-related Title VI compliance activities for WSDOT's review and approval. There are two RTPOs (NEWRTPO and Palouse) with Nondiscrimination Agreements in place, which allow them to report their compliance activities every three years rather annually.

In addition, the Lewis-Clark Valley MPO and the Skagit County Council of Governments initiated actions to establish their Title VI Program for this period.

Lewis-Clark Valley MPO submitted their Title VI Plan to Idaho Department of Transportation, which approved the document in July 2004. WSDOT expects to receive and approve the revised Title VI Plan from Skagit County Council of Governments before CY04. Additionally, QUADCO RTPO was recently contacted and advised to initiate the process of writing their Title VI compliance document also for WSDOT's approval. OEO expects to have all the remaining MPO and RTPO in the state with their Title VI compliance document approved and in place by Spring 2005.

Washington State MPOs and RTPOs

1. Benton Franklin Council of Governments (Benton Franklin)
2. Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (CWCOG)
3. Lewis-Clark Valley MPO
4. North East Washington Regional Transportation Planning Organization (NEW RTPO)
5. Palouse Regional Transportation Planning Organization (Palouse)
6. Puget Sound Regional Transportation Council (PSRC)
7. QUADCO RTPO
8. Skagit County Council Of Governments (Skagit)
9. Southwest Regional Transportation Council (RTC)
10. Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC)
11. Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC)
12. Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council (WVTC)
13. Whatcom Council of Governments (WCOG)
14. Yakima Valley Council of Governments (YVCOG)

Local Agencies Title VI Compliance

OEO continued working with the Highway and Local Programs Division in the review and publication of the Title VI chapter for WSDOT's Local Agencies Guidelines (LAG) Manual during FY04.

On July 22, 2004, the LAG Committee met with representatives from Highway and Local Programs (H&LP) Division and OEO to discuss the language in the Title VI Chapter and answer technical questions about the Title VI Program from the Committee members.

The LAG Committee was advised of the importance of including the chapter to help sub recipients comply with Title VI.

On October 13, 2004, H&LP advised the Title VI Coordinator that the Title VI Chapter of the LAG Manual will be published by mid November 2004. The publication of this document makes Title VI compliance directions accessible to more cities and counties across the state than by doing individual Title VI compliance reviews. The goal is to have all 96 certification acceptance (CA) cities and counties in the state with a functional Title VI Program in place by the end of FY08.

Statewide Title VI Coordinators Meetings

On December 12, 2003 and June 11, 2004, OEO participated in two Statewide Title VI Coordinators Meetings. The meeting in December took place in Clark County's Public Works while the one in June was hosted by the City of Tacoma. The meeting in Clark County had representation from the hosting County; Pierce County, Southwest Regional Transportation Council (RTC), WSDOT, King County, City of Tacoma and City of Seattle. City of Spokane, Spokane County and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) connected with the group via teleconference.

The December meeting promoted a good exchange of Title VI compliance information among the sub recipients represented, particularly, information on their compliance monitoring structure, educational opportunities, discussions on civil rights' involvement in the NEPA process, review of contracts to incorporate nondiscrimination language, revisions to their Title VI Plan and updates on Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) and BOOST programs. WSDOT provided updates on court cases inside and outside the state regarding challenges to the DBE Program, revisions to its External Complaints Procedures, revisions to the Department's Title VI Plan to include more specific EJ and LEP compliance information, the status of the LAG Manual's Title VI Chapter and status on BizTrack and BizWeb software applications to the DBE program.

The Title VI Coordinators meeting hosted by the City of Tacoma was not well attended. Mr. Peter Guzman, LEAP Coordinator, City of Tacoma, organized the meeting. Mr. Guzman made an attempt to advise all participating Title VI Coordinators about the meeting on June 11th, but only WSDOT showed up. WSDOT used the opportunity to explain to Mr. Guzman Title VI and DBE compliance issues.

Pierce County ended up hosting a "make-up" meeting for all Title VI Coordinators across the state, which took place on October 14, 2004, at the County's new Environmental Services Building in the Chambers Creek area.

The meeting was well attended and for the first time FHWA participated in this type of gathering, which was an added bonus. Pierce County, King County, Clark County, City of Tacoma, City of Seattle, WSDOT's OEO, WSDOT's Transportation Planning Office, Southwest Regional Transportation Council and FHWA were represented in the meeting. Topics such as strategic implementation of LEP and EJ requirements and the Title VI LAG Manual

Chapter were the main focus of the discussions, besides agencies' and WSDOT's Title VI implementation updates, training efforts and Title VI-related conferences. Based on a message received from the Puget Sound Regional Transportation Council (PSRC), it appears that the Planning Organizations are looking into having their own discussion sessions separated from the existing meetings, which are more geared toward local agencies' Title VI compliance. OEO found such alternative acceptable and will work with the Transportation Planning Office to initiate MPO/RTPO Title VI Coordinators meetings during CY05.

Internal Title VI Program Discussions

WSDOT's Title VI Coordinator initiated quarterly meetings with the Title VI Special Emphasis Areas starting on December 8, 2003. That first meeting served as the "icebreaker" for future discussions directed toward improving WSDOT's Title VI reporting. During the December meeting the Title VI Coordinator discussed with the Program Area Liaisons how to improve the existing Update Report Questionnaire, strategies to ensure agency-wide reporting and timelines for completion of the task.

January 20, 2004, the Title VI Coordinator met again with the Liaisons to discuss their recommendations for Title VI Update Questionnaire revisions. General recommendations were made to improve the questionnaire guidelines, which were to be discussed with FHWA.

After the January meeting, individual program discussions were conducted between the Title VI Coordinator and the Program Liaisons. The discussions focused on the upcoming revisions to the Title VI Update Questionnaire and the Title VI Plan due at the end of federal fiscal year 2004.

On April 30, 2004, the Title VI Coordinator sent an e-mail to all Title VI Liaisons to discuss the proposed idea from FHWA to have a summit type of discussion regarding the enhancement of Title VI reporting. FHWA also suggested to include in the discussion reporting areas that have been excluded in previous reports such as Rail Office, WSF, Procurement, Public Transportation and Maintenance.

On June 28-29, 2004, the FHWA, OEO staff and the Title VI Program Liaisons met to discuss how to improve the Title VI reporting process. Program area functions were discussed and it was suggested to add new and more specific questions to address Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) elements for every impacted program area, and to add more self-monitoring and nondiscrimination training discussions to the report.

The summit discussions served to initiate the work on the proposed revisions to the Title VI Update Report Questionnaire. Sample questionnaires from other DOTs such as CalTrans served as a model for the enhanced WSDOT's version of the same. After receiving input from the program areas, a revised Title VI questionnaire was finalized and now used to report WSDOT's Title VI activities for the current reporting period.

OEO will continue these meetings and will also look into developing Title VI training opportunities for WSDOT's Title VI Liaisons during the upcoming period. OEO will also continue adding Title VI special emphasis program areas to the discussions and coordinate Title VI compliance strategies with them. These areas are Maintenance, Procurement of Good and Services, Communications Office, WSF, Public Transportation and Commute Options Office, Program Management and possibly Finance and Administration, as they may become a partner in the development of LEP strategies for the Department's communications through its receptionist.

Limited English Proficiency

As reported during last year's update, on October 20, 2003, the Title VI Coordinator and Jim Medina, External Civil Rights Manager, met with Linda Mullen, WSDOT Communications Director, to explore partnering in the process OEO will initiate to implement the provisions of Executive Order 13166 on Limited English Proficiency (LEP). After this meeting, efforts were initiated by Ms. Mullen's office to establish discussion sessions called "Good Outreach Workgroup" to talk about how WSDOT handles public involvement, particularly, the outreach practices for minority citizens. The group had representation from the Environmental Services Office, regional Public Involvement Officers, H&LP, the Rail Office and OEO.

The Good Outreach Workgroup met on January 7 and 29, 2004, to analyze, identify and correct deficiencies in the Department's outreach efforts during the external communication process. OEO assisted the group in understanding the Limited English Proficiency requirements and how it relates to WSDOT's Title VI Program. OEO also used these meetings to learn how the communication processes are handled and to find ways to address potential language barriers against members of communities served by WSDOT as part of its public service.

The Good Outreach Workgroup ceased to meet after several meeting cancellations due to Ms. Mullen's workload. The last meeting took place between the Title VI Coordinator and the Environmental Services Office's NEPA Manager on February 3, 2004, where both discussed the possibility of creating a table showing the different opportunities for public involvement and civil rights requirements impacting such activities.

At this time, OEO is revising WSDOT's Title VI Plan to incorporate specific compliance information on Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency. The revision process is requiring close interaction with the Communications Office and the Human Resources Office to promote adequate exchange of expertise, information and resources while addressing LEP policy and procedures for the Department. OEO's goal is to be able to establish an agency-wide program to ensure LEP issues are properly addressed on a consistent basis during the delivery of WSDOT's program and activities to all people in the State of Washington. It is expected to have this process completed and in place by Summer 2005.

Title VI Brochure

During the reporting period the Title VI Coordinator found many opportunities to share the Department's Title VI Brochure with partners within the state and across the nation. Brochures were distributed electronically to Colorado DOT, Maryland DOT, North Carolina Justice Center and Tennessee DOT. These organizations heard positive comments on WSDOT's Title VI Program and contacted the Title VI Coordinator to learn more about our compliance strategies, particularly those efforts to promote Title VI compliance among local agencies and planning organizations.

Local agencies participating in WSDOT's Statewide Title VI Coordinator's meeting also received an electronic copy of the brochure during the reporting period.

Additionally there have been several opportunities to distribute our brochure through the ECRB Manager, OEO Director, EEO/OJT Contract Compliance Officer and OJT Support Services Coordinator. Whenever they attend functions such as conferences, job fairs, meetings and training opportunities they take brochures with them for its distribution among the general public, civil rights practitioners, managers, employment candidates, training attendees and others. Currently there is no tracking system that would indicate how many hardcopy brochures have been distributed during FY04, but the estimate is that close to 800 paper brochures have been distributed since August 2003. OEO will be tracking the distribution of Title VI brochures for the FY05 reporting period.

Currently, OEO is considering translating the brochure into, at least, the Spanish language as it is the most spoken foreign language in Washington State (322,000 individuals), according to the Modern Language Association's (MLA) website. OEO is working on having the brochure translated into the Spanish language by Spring 05. Other languages may follow as needs arise and resources become available. OEO will revise the brochure to incorporate CRRA and LEP language before its translation into other languages.

External Complaint Procedures

As reported in FY03, on June 10, 2003, the Title VI Coordinator transmitted, via electronic mail, WSDOT's revised External Complaint Procedures to the FHWA Division Civil Rights Program Manager for review and approval. The procedures remain without FHWA's approval.

WSDOT will consolidate the existing complaint procedures of the individual external civil rights programs into one process and present the information to FHWA for approval.

Title VI Update Questionnaire Revisions

During the reporting period, the Title VI Coordinator worked with the Program Area Liaisons to revise every program area section of the Title VI Update Report Questionnaire to ensure it covered not only Title VI administrative responsibilities but also the requirements under EO 12898 on Environmental Justice (EJ) and EO 13166 on Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The revisions

also included the incorporation of Maintenance and the Washington State Ferries (WSF) as separate program areas for Title VI compliance monitoring and reporting.

This year's report is based on the newly revised questionnaire, which covers more comprehensive Title VI compliance information than in previous versions of the same. The questionnaire has also served as a measuring tool to identify reporting areas that will require better coordination for data gathering during the current FY.

Through the exercise of revising the Title VI Update Report Questionnaire, OEO has significantly increased the awareness of Title VI, EJ and LEP compliance within the Department's Title VI Special Emphasis Program Areas. It is expected that the next reporting period will be even more comprehensive as there will be quarterly strategic discussions with the Title VI Liaisons on how to continue improving the Title VI data collection and reporting process.

Title VI Plan Revisions

WSDOT's Title VI Plan is currently being revised by the Title VI Coordinator to ensure the information remains current and to incorporate a prescriptive procedure for LEP compliance at all levels of the Department's communication process. OEO is working with the Communications Office to create a section in the plan devoted to their functions and responsibilities under Title VI, particularly, the LEP aspect of the Department's communication process. It is also our goal to present WSDOT's communicators with a tool kit and other resources so they can face the LEP challenges in their line of work with proactive resourcefulness.

Other revisions include more specific EJ and LEP responsibilities for the impacted program areas, incorporation of a LEP section for Public Involvement and information on how EJ and LEP impact the Department's public consultation process. OEO is working to have the plan revised by April 29, 2005.

Title VI Training Sessions

On January 15, 2004, the Title VI Coordinator, ECRB Manager and OEO Director attended a Title VI Training session conducted by Willie Harris, FHWA, Western Resource Center and Sandra Balmir, Planner, FHWA, Los Angeles Division Office. The training covered program requirements for state and local agencies, complaint investigation and compliance monitoring and reporting to FHWA.

OEO conducted no Title VI training during the reporting period. It is expected that once the Title VI Chapter of the LAG Manual is published, training for cities and counties will be scheduled through H&LP's T-2 Center. This may take place as soon as May 2005.

Sub-recipients, Cities, and Counties

Cities:

Seattle

On August 13, 2004, WSDOT approved City of Seattle's Title VI Update Report, FY03.

The City of Seattle presented their Title VI Update Report for FY04 on 2004. October 1, WSDOT will review the Update Report by the end of the calendar year.

Copies of City of Seattle's final document and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report review and approval process is completed for this sub recipient.

Tacoma

City of Tacoma received approval to its Title VI Update Report, FY03 on June 28, 2003.

The City presented its FY04 Title VI Update Report on October 14, 2004. WSDOT will complete its review of the document by the end of calendar year 2004.

Copies of the final document from City of Tacoma and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report review and approval process is completed for this subrecipient.

Spokane

On August 13, 2004, City of Spokane's Title VI Update Report, FY03, received WSDOT's approval.

The City of Spokane has not presented its Title VI Update Report, FY04 as of the date of this report. On October 18, 2004, the City was advised about its responsibility to produce its Title VI Update Report for WSDOT's approval. The information has not been received. WSDOT will follow up with the City's Title VI Coordinator to ensure we receive the information as soon as possible for approval.

Copies of the Title VI compliance document from City of Spokane and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report review and approval process is completed for this subrecipient.

Others

All other cities that have not presented their Title VI compliance document (plan or Nondiscrimination Agreement) are expected to begin doing so once the Title VI LAG Manual Chapter is published and proper training is offered.

Counties:**Pierce**

On June 28, 2004, Pierce County received WSDOT's approval to their Title VI Update Report, FY03.

Pierce County submitted its Title VI Update Report for FY04 on October 4, 2004. WSDOT is currently completing the review of the document for approval. WSDOT expects to complete the review of the County's Update Report by the end of calendar year.

Copies of the final document from Pierce County and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

King

King County received WSDOT's approval to its Title VI Update Report for FY03 on April 21, 2004.

WSDOT received King County's Title VI Update Report on October 1, 2004 and expects to complete its review by the end of calendar year 2004.

Copies of the final document from King County and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

Clark

On July 22, 2004, Clark County received WSDOT's approval to its Update Report for FY03.

The County's Title VI Update Report, FY04 was received by WSDOT on October 18, 2004. The document is scheduled for review and comments as soon as possible. WSDOT commits to review the document by the end of calendar year 2004.

Copies of the final document from Clark County and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

Spokane

On April 14, 2003, Spokane County presented its last set of revisions to its Title VI Plan for WSDOT's review. After comments were provided to the County Title VI representative, the County decided to stop all of their Title VI Program documentation efforts until the Title VI LAG Manual Chapter is published. Considering that prior to Spokane County there were other local agencies assuming the same position as the County and given the fact that the Title VI LAG Manual Chapter is about to be published, OEO will defer further compliance actions with Spokane County until the aforementioned document is published.

Information on this sub recipient's progress in its Title VI compliance actions will be shared with FHWA as it becomes available.

Others

All other counties that have not presented their Title VI compliance document (plan or Nondiscrimination Agreement) are expected to begin doing so once the Title VI LAG Manual Chapter is published and proper training is offered.

MPO/RTPO

Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC)

SRTC received approval to its Title VI Update Report FY03 on August 16, 2004.

As of the date of this report, SRTC has not submitted their Title VI Update Report, FY04. WSDOT's Title VI Coordinator will follow up with the agency's Transportation Manager to ensure the report is submitted to OEO as soon as possible.

Copies of the final document from SRTC and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report, FY04 process for this subrecipient is completed.

Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)

On May 5, 2004, PSRC received WSDOT's approval to its Title VI Update Report for FY03, and its revised Title VI Plan, April 2004 version.

On October 29, 2004, PSRC presented its Title VI Update Report, FY04 for WSDOT's review and approval. The information and its attachments will be reviewed by WSDOT for approval by the end of calendar year 2004.

Copies of the final documents from PSRC and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report, FY04 process for this subrecipient is completed.

North East Washington Regional Transportation Planning Organization (NEW RTPO)

NEW RTPO received WSDOT's approval to its Nondiscrimination Agreement on February 19, 2003.

NEWRTPO is due to submit its first Title VI Update and Accomplishment Report by October 15, 2006.

Palouse RTPO

Palouse received WSDOT's approval to its Title VI Nondiscrimination Agreement on March 24, 2003.

Palouse is due to submit its first Title VI Update and Accomplishment Report by October 15, 2006.

Benton-Franklin

Benton Franklin submitted its first Title VI Update Report on February 4, 2004. On the same date, OEO reviewed the document finding that the report required more specific information in some of the reporting elements. WSDOT will contact Benton Franklin to ensure they initiate a more comprehensive reporting for every federal fiscal year as the records indicate. WSDOT has not done so. We expect to receive the report by November 30, 2004. WSDOT will complete its review for comments/approval by the end of calendar year 2004.

Copies of FY04 Update from Benton Franklin and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report **process for this subrecipient is completed.**

Southwest Regional Transportation Council (RTC)

RTC received WSDOT's approval to its Title VI Update Report FY03 on August 16, 2004.

RTC's Title VI Coordinator has informed that he's about to release RTC's Title VI Update Report for FY04. WSDOT expects to receive the information by November 5, 2004. WSDOT will review the document for approval by the end of calendar year 2004.

Copies of RTC's Title VI Update Report, FY04 and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

Yakima Valley Council of Governments (YVCOG)

YVCOG received WSDOT's approval to its Title VI Plan on February 28, 2003.

WSDOT contacted YVCOG on July 23, 2004 to discuss the submittal of their FY03 and FY04 Title VI activities combined in one Update Report. They were notified that the information was due to OEO by October 15, 2004. The document is currently overdue. WSDOT will follow up with this subrecipient until the information is received for review and approval. YVCOG may face a "deficiency status" determination if it continues missing its Title VI deadlines.

Copies of the final document from YVCOG and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report, FY04 process for this subrecipient is completed.

Whatcom Council of Governments (WCOG)

WCOG received WSDOT's approval to its Title VI Plan on February 21, 2003.

WCOG has yet to submit its Title VI Update Report for FY03 and FY04. The documents are currently overdue. WSDOT will follow up with this subrecipient to ensure they initiate the process of completing its report by due date every year.

Copies of the final document from WCOG and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council (WVTC)

WSDOT is completing the review of WVTC's revised 2004 Title VI Plan and their Title VI Update Report, FY03. Their Update Report FY04 has not yet been received by WSDOT for review and approval.

WVTC's Title VI Plan was revised to address EJ and LEP requirements per May 11, 2004 written recommendations from WSDOT.

Copies of the final document from WVTC and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (CWCOG)

CWCOG has yet to submit its Title VI Update Report for FY04. The document is currently overdue. WSDOT will follow up with this subrecipient as to their obligation to produce a Title VI Update Report at the end of every federal fiscal year.

Copies of the final document from CWCOG and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC)

On July 22, 2004, TRPC received WSDOT's approval to their Title VI Update Report, FY 03. TRPC submitted its Title VI Update Report, FY04 on October 15, 2004. WSDOT is in the process of completing the review of the Title VI Update Report, FY04 for approval, which should take place by the end of CY04.

Copies of the final document from TRPC and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the Title VI Update Report process for this subrecipient is completed.

QUADCO Regional Transportation Council (QUADCO RTC)

On September 22, 2004, the Title VI Coordinator contacted Bill Wiebe, WSDOT's Transportation Planning Office, who visited QUADCO RTC to discuss administrative matters including Title VI compliance. QUADCO was advised to designate a contact person to initiate Title VI compliance work with WSDOT's Title VI Coordinator as soon as possible. WSDOT expects to start working with QUADCO by November 15, 2004.

Copies of QUADCO's final Title VI Plan and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the process of reviewing and approving the Title VI Plan for this subrecipient is completed.

Skagit Council of Governments (SCOG)

Since May 18, 2004, WSDOT's Title VI Coordinator has been working with SCOG in the development of their Title VI Plan and program structure. Several draft versions of their plan have been reviewed and commented by WSDOT since.

SCOG is currently developing their EJ and LEP compliance policy and process to incorporate as part of its Title VI Plan. We expect to have their final document submitted and approved by November 30, 2004.

Copies of SCOG's final Title VI Plan and WSDOT's letter of approval will be forwarded to FHWA Division office once the process of reviewing and approving the Title VI Plan for this subrecipient is completed.

Lewis and Clark Valley MPO

On July 20, 2004, Lewis and Clark County MPO's Policy Board adopted their Title VI Plan. This MPO works with two DOTs in their planning program, namely WSDOT and Idaho DOT (IDOT). It was decided that IDOT would be the lead agency for Title VI compliance monitoring as they disperse the most federal funds to Lewis and Clark Valley MPO.

A copy of their Title VI Plan for this MPO is in OEO's files and a copy of their Update Report, FY04 requested to IDOT to also include in our records. All other counties that have not presented their Title VI compliance document (plan or Nondiscrimination Agreement) are expected to begin doing so once the Title VI LAG Manual Chapter is published and proper training is offered.

Consultants

During the reporting period WSDOT concentrated its time and resources to complete revisions and have the Title VI LAG Manual Chapter published and disseminated. There are no activities or accomplishments related to consultant contractors' Title VI compliance efforts to report at this time.

IV. COMPLAINTS

Genie Service Company, Inc.

This complaint was reported last year. The complaint, which was filed against WSDOT, has been referred to FTA for handling.

Don Shaffer and the Kent Pedestrian Bridge Project

Mr. Don Shaffer, a commercial building owner in Kent, requested WSDOT to investigate a Title VI-related complaint. According to Mr. Shaffer, the builders of the Kent Pedestrian Skybridge Project negatively impacted his building by limiting its parking area and causing structural damage to it while moving machinery and equipment during the life of the project. Mostly minority business owners occupy Mr. Shaffer's building. Based on his tenant's ethnicity (mostly Middle-Easterners) Mr. Shaffer wanted to file a complaint on their behalf under the nondiscrimination provision of Title VI and Environmental Justice.

Because this is a Sound Transit project, it was referred to them for handling under the approved Title VI Plan and complaint procedures.

V. PROGRAM AREAS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. PLANNING

- 1. What activities and/or studies were conducted that provided data relative to minority persons, neighborhoods, income levels, physical environment and travel habits? Please list each activity or study and include a very brief statement about the activity or study and how it was/will be used.**

The Southwest Region, Eastern Region and the Central Puget Sound Urban Planning Office (UPO) are participating in the Congestion Relief Analysis project. This project used census data to determine location and density of ethnic minority and low-income populations. A study was generated to examine the potential effects of hypothetical regional transportation investment choices.

The Olympic Region Planning Office has been developing responses to address resource agencies comments to the Draft SR 167 Extension EIS and revising the Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice and Relocation/Displacement Discipline Reports, which the planning office developed. The results of these revised discipline reports will be used for inclusion in the Final SR 167 Extension EIS. This project is addressing the addition of a new highway extension and corridor, which will connect SR 167 from the Port of Tacoma to the City of Puyallup and existing SR 167.

The Olympic Region during this period also participated in the review and revision of the SR 305 Poulsbo Land Use and Relocation Discipline Report, which includes Environmental Justice analysis. The results of this discipline report will be used for inclusion in the SR 305 Poulsbo Environmental Assessment (EA). This project is addressing the widening of SR 305 within the vicinity of Poulsbo.

The Eastern Region is presently in the process of developing a Route Development Plan (RDP) for SR 291. The limits of this plan begin within the City Of Spokane and end north of Spokane approximately 20 miles near the community of Tum Tum. Early in the process we held four Listening Posts where we gathered input from the citizens on what their concerns were on the existing route and what type of improvements they would like to see. These Listening Posts were held in four different communities throughout the route to gain input.

2. Were there any opportunities to assess special language needs in a community served by the Transportation Planning Office during the reporting period? If so, were those language needs properly addressed through professional language services? Explain.

The Olympic Region primarily conducts reviews of census data to assess special language requirements in project areas. We follow up these reviews where possible by contacting local organizations such as church organizations, clubs, and associations to help identify special interest groups. During this period our reviews did not identify any significant presence of non-English speaking people in any of the projects that the planning office was affiliated with that required translators services, non-English ads or flyers, etc. No brochures or other information were prepared in alternate languages during this period.

In the Eastern Region during the development of the SR 291 RDP, Eastern Region Planning sent out approximately 23,000 flyers to surrounding citizens notifying them of what was taking place with the RDP and when, where, and time of the Listening Posts. Also included within the flyer was a pre-paid postage response card asking for their input on the existing route and type of improvements they would like to see.

3. Identify the number of public consultation forums held during the reporting period. What efforts did you use to ensure citizen participation in these public forums, particularly minorities, women and low-income? Were minorities, women and low-income citizens, both individually and through their organizations, represented in the citizen participation effort? How many and in what capacity?

During this last year, the Olympic Region planning office assisted the various regional project offices in the arena of public involvement by assisting in the public announcements and also the conduct of open houses and public meetings. Some of the projects supported included the SR 3/SR 303 Waaga Way interchange project: sent flyers, placed Ads in the local newspapers and held a public open house. Flyers were sent to all residents living in the project area and to those on a selected mail list. Approximately 60 people attended the meeting.

The Olympic Region Planning Office supported the public open house efforts for the SR 161 widening project. Flyers were sent to all residents living in the project area and to those on a selected mail list solicit attendance in these open houses. Also supported project office efforts with a public open house for the SR 305 Vegetation Spray project. Through flyers and newspaper Ads we were able to get approximately 100 people to attend this meeting.

Started support for the first segment of the SR 16 HOV project (48th Street to Pacific in Tacoma) through the conduct of meetings with individual groups along the I-5 Corridor to explain the HOV project to them. Standard forms about Title VI participation were offered to public meeting participants. Do not have available the count of women, minorities or low-income who filled forms, these are kept with the project offices.

During this reporting period, the Olympic Region Planning Office completed a Route Development Plan (RDP) for SR 161 during which this office has conducted two public meetings and one stakeholder meeting. We initiated another RDP on SR 3 during which three public meetings and four stakeholder meetings were conducted. WSDOT Title VI Public Involvement forms were offered to public meeting participants. None of the forms were returned at these events hence, we did not have exact count of women, minorities or low-income attending these meetings. Although women appear to be represented at the meetings in proportion to their presence in the community for all public sessions, no organizations representing them, or minority or low-income citizens were formally represented at these meetings. Once forms are filled out and collected after the meetings are over, the information is forwarded to OEO for their analysis. The Transportation Planning Office (TPO) will discuss with OEO's Title VI Coordinator our challenges collecting data on the race, color, national origin and gender of the individuals attending the public meetings assisted by our office. We are open to receive OEO's recommendations to ensure our data gathering process offers reliable information we can use to determine how effective our outreach for minority, low income and LEP populations has been during a public consultation process.

Invitation to participate on the stakeholder committee was extended to entities identified as having an interest in transportation related issues, including representation from local jurisdictions, emergency responders, the school district, elected officials, public transit agencies, businesses with freight related activities, homeowners' associations, community college, bicycle clubs, tribes whose usual and accustomed areas the route falls within, and others in the community who had expressed an interest in SR 3. Membership on the stakeholder committee remained open until after the first public meeting. At the public meeting, two business owners and two citizens at large expressed an interest in participating as stakeholders and were incorporated into the committee.

Notices for public meetings were mailed to approximately 4,500 households by zip code to residents potentially interested in or affected by the route development plan. WSDOT staff met with two homeowner/community associations by invitation to explain the purpose

of a route development plan. Both associations elected a member to represent them on the stakeholder committee.

4. Describe the mechanisms used to identify what communities (minorities, women and low-income) were represented at these public consultation forums. Was data on minority, women and low-income attendees collected in those meetings? Explain the methodology used to collect the data. Was the data analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the outreach to include Title VI protected groups into the public consultation process? What was the outcome?

In the Olympic Region as noted earlier, data about minority and low-income status of those attending public consultation forums was gathered using “Title VI Meeting Attendees Form”. We ask everyone who signed in and attends the meetings to fill out the forms. Since this is completely voluntary by participating individuals we normally get poor responses, due to reluctance in providing their personal information. Therefore, our ability to conduct any analysis is very limited and would not provide a true picture of the effectiveness of our outreach efforts. As stated before, we are working the Title VI Coordinator to find ways to make this data gathering process more effective.

5. Provide a summary of Title VI compliance self-monitoring activities conducted within your program, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.

The Olympic Region Planning Office makes every effort to ensure Title VI activities are conducted during the planning process. In fact, we’ve recently published (January 2004) the Olympic Region Transportation Planning Manual, of which Chapter 3 is dedicated to “Public Communication and Involvement.” Sections are included which highlight requirements concerning Title VI, Environmental Justice (EJ), compliance with Americans for Disabilities Act (ADA), how to identify stakeholders, get good public involvement, and conduct successful external meetings.

6. What Title VI training was provided within your program?

The Olympic Region planning office did not conduct any formal Title VI training during this period, however the office did develop a Transportation Planning Manual (mentioned above) that was provided to all office personnel as a how-to guide on the planning process and public communications and involvement. The manual provides guidance as to how to engage the public and stakeholders in a dialog to include Title VI guidelines.

The Urban Planning Office had Kathleen McKinney, David Williams, and Jodi Peterson (FHWA) put on EJ Training for 8 UPO staff on May 24, 2004.

The UPO and its consultants enforce non-discrimination in every aspect of its employee relations and the conduct of its project assignments. For example, EnviroIssues has worked directly with WSDOT to develop ADA/Title VI language for public materials.

EnviroIssues attended a demographic analysis-training workshop that provided instruction on how to identify and query information about minority and low-income populations.

7. What Title VI training was attended by program staff?

See answer to question 6.

8. List any significant problem areas in your program's Title VI compliance efforts and corrective actions taken to resolve them.

No significant problem areas in our Title VI program were identified during this period other than what has been mentioned about the continued lack of cooperation and response by the public in filling out the "Title VI Meeting Attendees Form".

9. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.

All WSDOT Planning offices plan to continue to follow State and Federal guidelines in the implementation of Title VI requirements.

The Olympic Region over the next year will be completing the SR 3 RDP as well as initiating a joint RDP with Southwest Region centered on SR 7 where we will continue to apply good Title VI, Environmental Justice, communication, and public involvement practices to ensure citizen participation in these public forums, particularly minorities, women and low-income. We will continue to look for ways to capture more specific data for targeted groups when identified.

Olympic Region will also continue supporting/marketing our office to the region's Project Offices to assist in project public involvement, outreach, hearings, and other types of project and community involvement efforts. As part of that support, we will be identifying the communities and Title VI protected groups and communicating with these groups to ensure their representation at project public consultation forums.

The UPO will, in general, determine whether "environmental justice" communities – that is, ethnic minority persons or persons whose income

is at or below the poverty thresholds from the US Census Bureau's Current Population Reports on Income and Poverty -- are present in the corridor vicinity of the projects in our office and if they are, UPO will do a preliminary assessment of whether the corridor improvement alternatives would potentially have disproportionate adverse effects on these populations.

UPO will also do a preliminary assessment of potential benefits to such populations. Identification of such populations will be based on Census data. Preliminary evaluation of potential impacts will be based on preliminary assessments of air quality, noise, community, transportation, and visual impacts of the alternatives under consideration.

UPO will also use the identification of ethnic minority or low-income populations to assure that public outreach activities are targeted to such populations to ensure that they have opportunity to provide input to the alternatives identification and screening processes.

UPO Projects for the next year:

SR 167 HOT Lane Pilot Project

Assuming we receive authority to develop the SR 167 HOT Lane Pilot Project from the 2005 Washington State Legislature and we receive federal funding to begin implementing the proposal, WSDOT will complete the Planning phase and begin the Design phase of the SR 167 pilot project in 2005. Environmental Justice and Title VI issues will be a critical focus of the NEPA analysis, as well as the public outreach and education campaign to be conducted during these phases of the project.

Through surveys, public forums and other mechanisms, the demographic characteristics, travel patterns, and special needs of environmental justice and Title VI populations will be identified. This information will be used to help ensure the pilot project's public outreach and education activities effectively engage environmental justice and Title VI populations and that the specific issues and concerns these populations have regarding the pilot project are addressed.

SR 167 Corridor Study

In the near future, the project team will be initiating a demographic analysis of the corridor from I-405 in King County to SR 512 in Pierce County.

I-5 Rehab and Bottleneck Improvement Projects

Since this has only recently started, EJ and Title VI strategies have not been developed yet. Strategies to incorporate EJ and Title VI will be developed in the near future.

SR 164/SR 169 Route Development Plans

It is anticipated that the outreach efforts will identify whether populations with special language needs are present in the corridors and if so, to provide translators or signers (in the case of hearing impaired populations) at public meetings as required.

The project team has scheduled a series of 4 and 6 open houses along each respective corridor over the course of the study and will make concerted effort to identify and engage participation by all citizens, including minorities, women and low-income groups. Individual interviews including some with Native American tribal members have been conducted. Other specific and directed efforts will be organized, as necessary.

10. Were any civil rights complaints received as a result of WSDOT's planning process e.g., public involvement activities, and lack of coordination with Indian tribal governments, contracting opportunities for planning studies or corridor studies? If so, how many? Summarize each complaint and the status, with actions proposed and taken.

No civil rights complaints have ever been received as a result of the WSDOT planning process or any of the Region or headquarters Planning Office actions.

11. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of employees, by program, working within the Transportation Planning Office. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and women staff?

Please see Attachment 1 with a summary of all Title VI Program Area's staff. There were a total of 83 vacancies of which 24 were filled. Out of those 24 hires one was a Hispanic and 10 were females. Please see Attachments 2 and 3 with a summary of the hiring activities for this program area. Hiring practices are conducted according to the Department's Affirmative Action policies and procedures.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- 1. Please provide a summary of actions taken within ESO to ensure adherence to its Title VI responsibilities per WSDOT's Title VI Plan. List any significant challenges and corrective actions taken. Goals for next year?**

The Environmental Services Office (ESO) takes seriously its responsibilities for Title VI compliance. This last federal fiscal year, 2003/2004, saw a number of significant changes in the direction of improved Title VI compliance within the Environmental Services Office.

Although reported in detail in the table found in our response to question #5, the following summary provides highlights within the context of the revised reporting areas.

- A. Significant changes to guidance on how to identify environmental justice issues and perform environmental justice analyses during the environmental process was completed. This was accomplished in several ways.
 - a. A comprehensive rewrite of Chapter 457, Social, Economic and Relocation and Chapter 458 Environmental Justice of the Environmental Procedures Manual was completed.
 - b. Training on these changes was created and completed in the winter and spring of 2004. Details are outlined in this report.
 - c. An Internet webpage on environmental justice was created and launched.
- B. Environmental Services Office was an active participant in the Title VI meeting hosted by Office of Equal Opportunity the spring of 2004. The purpose of this meeting was to improve the Title VI reporting process.
- C. Environmental Services Office had several internal meetings to discuss and develop methods for improved compliance and tracking of Title VI.
- D. Targeted Outreach – Overall as awareness of the need to improve compliance with Title VI/EJ has increased, WSDOT's projects have improved their amount of public involvement with efforts to include minorities and low-income in the transportation decision making process.

- E. Limited English Proficiency – Compliance with Presidential Executive Order 13166 was included in the rewrite of the Environmental Procedures Manual, Chapters 457 and 458. Projects are beginning to improve efforts to identify whether there is a need for translation of materials and interpreters for meetings.
- F. Overall, with increased compliance monitoring and consulting from ESO, projects have greatly increased their effective use of Chapters 457 and 458. This has varied from “well” to “insufficient”, but is expected to continue to improve as a new tracking system and ESO monitoring and consulting is continued.

Goals for next year

As a result of both the outcome of the spring Title VI meeting and internal ESO discussions, an improved tracking system is under development. This will align both the new reporting questions developed and ESO’s goal of improved Title VI compliance. Additionally, ESO’s goals for the next federal fiscal year would be to:

- Provide assistance toward improved Title VI compliance
- Increase awareness of need for Title VI compliance
- Improve compliance tracking
- Improve alignment of reporting with actual compliance

2. Please list all Title VI related training sessions (including EJ) being conducted or attended by ESO staff during the reporting period. For sessions conducted by ESO, please report name of course, dates, and attendance.

As a result of the 2003 substantive revisions in the WSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual to Chapter 457, Social, Economic and Relocation and Chapter 458, Environmental Justice, training was created and delivered during 2004. The focus of this training was Environmental Justice. This was the first Environmental Justice training series created and delivered solely by WSDOT.

A total of six workshops were completed. The majority of the attendees were WSDOT employees, with some consultants and local agency staff. Workshops were 4 ½ hours long.

CLASS #	DATE	LOCATION	# OF PARTICIPANTS
1	Jan. 14, 2004	Moses Lake-Eastern, SC & NC regions	19
2	March 30, 2004	Vancouver-SW Region	17
3	May 4, 2004	Tumwater-Olympic Region	17
4	May 11, 2004	NW Region	21
5	May 24, 2004	Urban Corridors/Planning	15
6	June 15, 2004	NW Region	29

The workshops were very successful with requests for additional workshops as a result. Since their purpose was to ensure the changes to the Environmental Procedures Manual were understood, there were no plans to deliver future workshops.

However, since it was recognized there would be an ongoing need for information on environmental justice, the training materials were combined with other applicable information into a website: <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/environment/envJustice/default.htm>. The website was designed to be on the Internet, since many of our environmental documents are done by consultants. Both consultants, local agency and WSDOT staff is now making use of the information.

Since the training, in early 2004, the quality of environmental justice analysis has improved immensely. Although some of the more difficult parts of conducting an analysis still remain confusing, overall documents have improved in the following ways:

- Better identification of community impacts through improved public involvement
- Determining if EJ populations are disproportionately impacted or not and backing up the determination with data
- Improved, inclusive public involvement
- Improved, more accurate methodology
- Use of more than one data source to draw conclusions

This has resulted in less review time having a positive impact on project cost. Some project teams are also asking for review of methodology by either WSDOT Environmental Services and/or FHWA. Although this commits some early staff time, it results in less “rework” later on.

3. Was data collected on the race, color, national origin and gender of EIS hearing attendees? If so, please report the information by project.

This information is captured in the Design section of this report as their Hearing Coordinators do all the work associated with setting up the public hearings for the discussions associated with Design/Environmental type of activities.

4. For Environmental Justice analyses reviewed by ESO please provide the following by project:

- a. How well did the Environmental Justice analyses for EISs and EAs appear to follow Chapter 458 of WSDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual? Rate as well, sufficient, insufficient.
- b. How many indicated possible adverse impacts on minorities and/or low income persons?
- c. If minorities and/or low income are present in the project area, does the public involvement information indicate it is inclusive?
- d. Using Department of Justice guidelines, if minorities and/or low income are impacted by the project, were bilingual or non-English advertisements, announcements, notices or translators were used?

5. Please provide the following for published DEISs and EAs.

- a. Method of notification used and description of efforts at inclusiveness of minority and low-income.
- b. List by project any targeted outreach done.
- c. List by project efforts to engage bilingual and non-English speaking people impacted by the project.
- d. List any mitigation commitments made for Environmental Justice by project.

ESO combined its answers to questions 4 and 5 for this reporting period. Although answers to these questions were covered as part of the response for question #1 and in the chart below, ESO recognizes that the report is not complete. Given the change in reporting questions during the year, project specific answers were not available to provide greater specificity. With new tracking aligned with the revised questions, this should improve in the future.

CATEGORY	STATUS	DESCRIPTION	COMPLIANCE STATUS
DEIS	Published	SR 99 Alaska Way Viaduct DEIS Issued 3/31/04	Project team followed new EPM guidance; excellent public involvement; interviews of social service organizations. Model program. New issues on dealing with homeless. Homeless under the viaduct, conclusions not final yet.
DEIS	Published	City of Issaquah - SE Issaquah Bypass DSEIS Issued 5/17/04	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
DEIS	Published	SR 35 - Columbia River Crossing DEIS issued 12/9/03	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	EA issued 7/6/04	SR14 Unstable Slopes	Followed new EPM guidance somewhat, returned for revision. Low income/minorities in area. Don't appear to be disproportionately impacted.
EA	EA issued 1/20/04	SR 240 - Tri Cities Additional Lanes	Followed new EPM guidance, will continue to do inclusive public involvement. Low-income housing impacted, not disproportionate.
EA	EA issued 6/15/04	US 101 Station Camp Park	Not reviewed by ESO. No information on this project due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period
EA	EA issued 9/14/04	I-5 Everett HOV, SR 526 to SR 2	An environmental hearing was held 9/28/04 where Title VI forms were presented and offered to those attending. No forms were returned. The notice of the availability of the EA and the hearing notice were published in a Hispanic newspaper. A sentence in the legal notice was also written in Spanish identifying where people could get further information on the project. Translators were present at the hearing but their service was not required. Some business employed minorities with some EJ populations near the north and south end of the

			project. No impacts. Public comment period to end 10/13/04.
EA	EA issued 2/20/04	City of Everett - 41st Street Overcrossing	Some business employed minorities in the area. No impacts.
EIS	Active or presumed active	U.S. 395 N. Spokane Corridor FEIS issued April 1997 Re-evaluation underway	Impacts on community previously impacted when I-5 was built. Avoidance difficult. Public involvement has been intensive. Document reviewed did not follow new guidance in EPM. Returned for revisions. WSDOT held open houses, September 23 rd , 30th and on October 2nd and 9th, 2003. Low income with few minorities neighborhood being impacted. Initial review did not give enough information to assess impact.
EIS	Legal review at FHWA DEIS not issued this year.	SR 28 - Wenatchee Eastside Corridor	Original document was not adequate. Subsequent work was excellent on public outreach, assessment of community. Followed new EPM Guidance. Hispanic community, not disproportionately impacted.
EIS	DEIS not issued this year.	King County - South Park Bridge	Impacts cannot be completely avoided. Original document was deficient in this area. Subsequent documents have vastly improved and adequately follow new EPM Guidance. Low income, minority (mainly Hispanic) community potentially disproportionately impacted depending on alternative chosen.
EIS	DEIS not issued this year.	SR 520 Bridge Replacement & HOV	Project team following new EPM guidance. Challenge will be possible disproportionate impact on low income from bridge tolls on new facility.
EIS	FSEIS Issued 8/3/04	Pierce Co. - Cross-Base Highway	Reviewed by FHWA HQ. Mitigation based on input from community. American Lake Gardens, low income, minority neighborhood disproportionately impacted but mitigation proposed.
EIS	FSEIS Issued	King County Elliot Bridge	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be

	1/21/04		developed for next reporting period.
EIS	FSEIS Issued 12/12/03	I-5 Toutle River Park to Maytown	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EIS	FEIS Issued 4/21/04	I-90 Two Way - HOV	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EIS	Project shelved.	King County - Novelty Hill Road	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EIS	DEIS not issued this year.	King County - E. Lake Sammamish Master Plan	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EIS	FEIS not issued yet.	SR 104 Edmonds Ferry Crossing DEIS Issued 2/25/98.	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EIS	DEIS not issued this year.	City of Seattle - Magnolia Bridge Viaduct	Discipline reports being written. No other information available yet.
EIS	DEIS not issued this year.	I-90 Snoqualmie Pass East	Mountain pass project with low potential for civil rights issues. None reported.
EIS	DEIS not issued this year.	Kelso to Martin's Bluff Rail Project	October '03 a social elements (including EJ) discipline report was completed. No impacts.
EA	Not issued this year. Active or presumed active	City of Wenatchee - SR 285 - Wenatchee (South End)	Project team did excellent outreach and based mitigation on input from public involvement. Project could be model if all goes as planned. Minority community disproportionately impacted but extensive mitigation proposed.
EA	Not issued this year. Active or presumed active	Clark Co. - NE 18th Street, 87th to 162nd	Received for review after final EA. Did not completely follow new EPM guidance. Suggested revisions. Some minority/low income in area. Probably not disproportionate impact.
EA	Not issued this year. Active or presumed active	I-82 - Union Gap Valley Mall Blvd.	Some noise impacts cannot be mitigated to acceptable levels. Document needed revision to gather more information on displaced residents in that area. Public Meeting held March 2003. Some impact to low income/minorities. Does not appear to

			be disproportionate.
EA	Not issued this year. Active or presumed active	City of Bremerton - Downtown Bremerton Pedestrian / BTC Access Improvements (SR 304)	Followed new EPM guidance somewhat, returned for revision. Minorities impacted by project, not disproportionate.
EA	Not issued this year.	I-5/SR 502	Mostly follows new EPM guidance. Sent back for revisions. Doesn't appear any impacts would be disproportionate
EA	Active or presumed active	SR 31 Metaline to Canadian Border	Not reviewed by ESO. No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Active or presumed active	Bigelow Gulch Urban Connector	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Not issued this year.	Issaquah-Fall City Road	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Not issued this year.	SR 522 Corridor	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Not issued this year	SR 524 – 24 th Ave. to SR 527	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Not issued this year	City of Seattle – South Lake Union	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Project shelved.	Mason County - Belfair Bypass	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Issued 11/6/03	SR 24 - I-82 to Keys Road	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Not issued this year.	Keystone / Port Townsend Terminals	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.
EA	Not issued this year.	Yakima Grade Separation	No information on this area due to lack of new tracking system that will be developed for next reporting period.

- 6. Of the published DEISs and EAs, please list any known Title VI or Environmental Justice complaints received as a result of the NEPA social analysis. Summarize each complaint and the status, with actions proposed and taken.**

No Title VI or EJ complaints were made known to ESO during the reporting period.

- 7. Please provide ethnicity, gender and job classification, by program within the Environmental Services Office.**

Please see Attachment #1 with a summary of all Title VI Program Area's staff.

C. RIGHT OF WAY

- 1. How many negotiations were made during the reporting period? Does the negotiator's log reflect any disparity in the negotiations between minorities and non-minorities?**

WSDOT entered into approximately 500 acquisitions during the reporting period. No disparities in negotiations between minorities and non-minorities are reflected in any negotiator's diary.

- 2. Were special language needs identified and addressed at any point during the property acquisition processes for the current reporting period? Explain.**

WSDOT Real Estates Services (RES) can use various resources to accommodate special language needs when it becomes apparent that they are needed. However, we have not kept statistical data on specific language needs and remedies.

Our office will be working with OEO's Title VI Coordinator to develop a process to track how often we receive requests for language assistance during property acquisition activities, set strategies to effectively provide such services and report the information as part of the Department's Title VI Update Report.

A good example of what we intend to do in this area is our experience with the SR 509, I-5 Congestion Relief Project. The EIS identified a large community of Vietnamese individuals on the referenced project. We addressed their needs by having our Relocation Assistance brochure translated and printed in Vietnamese

- 3. Did minorities, women and low-income raise any concerns regarding their options in the negotiation phase? If so, specify how many were minorities, women and low-income.**

No data was collected regarding any specific concerns.

- 4. Describe the mechanisms used to identify what communities (minorities, women and low-income) were represented in the negotiation phase. Was data collected on these populations?**

This information is collected during the EIS and reviewed by Real Estate Services. Acquisition does not collect data specific to communities represented in the communities represented in the negotiations phase.

5. Specify the number of relocations during the reporting period:

198

How many were minorities? Women? Low income?

Businesses	46
Minority Businesses	
Hispanic	1
Asia/Pac. Islander	3
Residential	57
Residential Owners	20
Residential Tenants	37
Minority Residential	
Asian/Pac. Islander	2
Hispanic	5
Female Head of Household	16
Elderly	6
Low Income	6
Personal Property Only	95
Owner	8
Tenant	87
Minority	
Hispanic	2

6. Were any concerns raised by minorities, women and/or low-income on replacement housing, referral housing, appraisals, relocation assistance, payments and property management?

None were raised.

7. Provide a summary of Title VI compliance self-monitoring activities conducted, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.

Real Estate Services will continue to monitor affected ethnic populations to determine if WSDOT needs to have relocation documents and brochures translated for displaced persons.

We will also continue to identify the need for translation services and provide them as necessary in acquisition and relocation assistance.

8. List any significant problem areas and corrective actions taken.

No problem areas identified.

9. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.

In the past we have conducted post-acquisition surveys of all owners affected by WSDOT projects. The results were kept by hand and have been misplaced. In the next year, with concurrence from RES managers (HQ and Regions), we plan to conduct post-acquisition surveys that will be tabulated electronically. Some of the questions will deal with Title VI issues, such as; do you consider yourself a minority and/or low income?

Did you require special accommodations during the process, such as an interpreter? Do you feel that you were treated fairly by the State?"

10. Did your program receive any civil rights complaints in the following Right of Way functional areas:

- a. Appraisals
- b. Negotiations
- c. Relocation Assistance and Payments
- d. Property Management

If so, how many? Summarize each complaint and the status, with actions proposed and taken.

No civil rights complaints were received in any of the R/W functional areas.

11. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of employees, by program, working within the Real Estates Services. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase minority and female recruitment?

Please see Attachment #1 with a summary of all Title VI Program Area's staff.

During the reporting period, there were 10 vacancies that needed to be filled in HQ Real Estate Services. The majority of the vacancies were open competitive and were filled with 5 females and 5 males; all Caucasians. No minorities were on the lists provided by HRO.

D. DESIGN

- 1. How many public hearings were held during the reporting period concerning location of a project? How were the hearings advertised, and was it adequate to provide notification to minorities and low-income communities?**

Of the 7 public hearings during the reporting period 3 hearings were related to the location of a project.

Hearings were advertised through newspapers, interest list notification, local agencies and local news media (radio, television), minority oriented media, community based organizations.

Minority oriented media was utilized on the SR 509 Corridor/ I-5 Improvement/ South Access Rd. Project to ensure proper outreach to minority communities.

- 2. Describe how minorities, women and low-income populations were provided opportunities to be involved in project selection processes.**

When appropriate, minority leaders are identified through ethnic community based organizations. These leaders were encouraged to provide input identifying their preference as to the location and design of the highway projects.

- 3. Describe the mechanisms used to identify what populations (minorities, women and low-income) were represented in the project selection processes.**

Although minority groups and individuals are always encouraged to participate in the hearings through our outreach program, there is no method in place that would accurately record the exact number of minority, women and low-income community members attending our public involvement meetings. Title VI forms were used but, as previously discussed, there is very little support to this information gathering process from the public. WSDOT is contemplating assign a staff to explain the Department's Title VI data gathering process to meeting attendees along with issuing the Title VI forms.

- 4. Describe what project selection decisions if any, were affected by Title VI or Environmental Justice issues?**

No decisions were changed because of Title VI or Environmental Justice issues.

- 5. Provide a summary of Title VI self-monitoring activities conducted, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.**

There were no self-monitoring activities conducted in the Design Office this reporting year. With the Title VI Coordinator's assistance the

Design Office will design approaches to conduct self-monitoring activities to ensure Title VI compliance within our program area. This subject will be discussed during the upcoming quarterly meetings with the Department's Title VI Coordinator.

6. What Title VI training was provided within your program?

On June 28 and 29, 2004, the Design Office's Title VI Liaison attended the Title VI Program discussion session with FHWA and OEO to discuss strategies for monitoring compliance and reporting our activities.

7. What Title VI training was attended by you program personnel?

No one from the Design Office attended any Title VI session during this reporting year.

8. List any significant problem areas and corrective actions taken.

No significant problem areas were identified. As an accomplishment, we are continuing to increase our efforts, on a statewide basis, to ask open house and hearing attendees to voluntarily fill out a Title VI Public Involvement form.

9. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.

Continue to improve efforts to explain the purpose of the Title VI information gathering. Since the recent events in the last few years people are reluctant to give anything more than name, rank and serial number.

Continue assisting our regional staff about their Title VI responsibilities as part of our one DOT approach to Title VI compliance.

10. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of your staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase minority and female recruitment?

Please see Attachment #1 with a summary of all Title VI Program Area.

The Design Office had 21 vacancies for the reporting period. Of those 15 were filled including 1 Asian American and 5 females. For a summary of hiring activities for this program area, please see Attachments 2 & 3.

11. What efforts were made to increase minority and female recruitment?

Recruitment for those positions was conducted based on WSDOT's Affirmative Action policies and procedures to ensure equal participation in that process.

12. Has your program received any civil rights complaints? If so, was any corrective action needed? What corrective action did the Department take?

There were no complaints filed in the Design Program area during the reporting period.

E. CONSTRUCTION

1. How many construction projects were initiated in this reporting period?

134 highway construction contracts were executed between 10/1/03 and 9/30/04. This excludes the 9 Facilities and 12 WSF contracts that were also executed during this period. The aforementioned contracts are excluded from our figures as they are not administered by the Construction Office. These numbers include emergency contracts that were paid through CAPS (Contract Administration & Payment Section).

2. Of those executed projects during the reporting period, how many were subjected to change orders caused by a Title VI issue? Please describe the type of Title VI issue involved and the nature of the change order implemented to resolve the situation.

The Construction office does not track whether a Title VI complaint during construction or if a Title VI related oversight or omission during design resulted in a change order during project construction.

Strategies to gather this data will be discussed with the Title VI Coordinator during next year's quarterly meetings.

3. How many public meetings were held to keep communities informed of projects? Were minorities, women and low-income populations represented at these meetings?

Public meetings are normally held during the design phase of the project. Public meetings during the construction phase are seldom, since the opportunity to incorporate public input has passed after execution of the contract.

a. Describe the mechanisms you used to identify what communities (minorities, women and low-income) were represented at these meetings.

During Planning and Design (including Environmental) public hearings, WSDOT uses its Title VI Public Involvement Forms, which has not provided reliable data on minorities, women and low-income status on meeting attendees. We are working with the Title VI Coordinator to improve this data gathering process.

b. Describe the efforts made to invite minorities, women, and low-income communities to the meetings.

Very seldom, the Construction Office offers public meeting opportunities. However, during those rare instances in which we conduct public hearings, our office follows the same public involvement process Design and Planning program use to target minority community members already identified through a demographic assessment. Some of the strategies to reach out to minority and low-income populations include the use of minority-oriented media such as radio stations and newspapers. Additionally flyers and other communications are translated into the languages spoken by the minority populations in the impacted area.

4. Provide a summary of Title VI self-monitoring activities conducted, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.

WSDOT construction contracts require the Contractor to comply with all applicable laws and regulations. Section 1-07.11 of the Standard Specifications references Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and requires that the Contractor perform specific activities to prevent discrimination in performance of the work. The full text of Section 1-07.11 is available at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/fasc/EngineeringPublications/Manuals/SS2004.PDF>

WSDOT contracts also require the Contractor to provide Monthly Employment Utilization Reports (WSDOT Form #820-010) and Annual EEO Report (FHWA 1391) for all federally assisted contracts over \$10,000.

There were no findings, recommendations or action items resulting from the above contract requirements.

5. What Title VI training was provided within your program?

None

6. What Title VI training was attended by your program personnel?

Government-to-Government training
TERO 101 (at Tribal/State Transportation Conference)

7. List any significant problem areas and corrective actions taken.

None

8. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.

The Construction office is developing a training program in cooperation with the OEO that will guide WSDOT Construction staff in applying DBE specifications.

9. Has your program received any civil rights complaints involving competitive bidding procedures? If so, was any corrective action needed, what corrective action did the Department take? (Provide summary of any concerns raised by Disadvantaged Business Enterprise firms concerning licensing, lack of subcontracting opportunities, etc.)

No complaints were filed involving competitive bidding procedures.

10. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender your program's staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and female employees?

The Construction Program includes approximately 35 project offices and between 700 to 1000 employees statewide. This information would need to be requested from the Human Resources Office.

Please see Attachment #1 with a summary of all Title VI Program Area's staff.

F. MAINTENANCE – This program area is work in progress. We expect to be able to report their activities for FY05.

- 1. How many maintenance projects were initiated in this reporting period?**
- 2. How many contract change orders had Title VI implications during this reporting period? Briefly describe how the implications were resolved.**
- 3. How many public meetings were held to keep communities informed of maintenance projects? Were minorities, women and low-income populations represented at these meetings?**
- 4. Describe the efforts made to invite minorities, women and low- income communities to the meetings.**
- 5. During the review period, were any procedures reviewed to assure nondiscrimination in subcontract agreements, first and second tier, material supply and equipment lease agreements?**

6. **How many maintenance contracts were issued during the reporting period? Dollar amount? How many of those went to a minority and/or women owned business?**
7. **Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of your staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and female staff?**
8. **Has your program received any civil rights complaints involving competitive bidding procedures? If so, was any corrective action needed, what corrective action did the Department take? (Provide summary of any concerns raised minority or women owned firms concerning licensing, lack of subcontracting opportunities, etc.)**

G. RESEARCH

1. **How many research projects are currently underway?**

There are currently 62 projects that are funded either with federal research funds or funds from other WSDOT programs.

2. **List universities and/or consultants currently conducting research projects and number of contracts and dollar amounts for each one. Please include any new start projects for this reporting period.**

- Lawrence Frank and Company, \$180,000
- Water Resources Consulting, \$10,000
- IBI Group, \$9,457 (n)
- MGS Engineering Consultants, \$84,985
- Battelle Memorial Institute: \$25,650 (n); \$125,000 (n); \$101,000 (n) and \$3,000,000 (n)
- Pacific International Engineering, \$774,135 (n)
- Camas Go On, \$5,500 (n)
- Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife: \$56,375; \$40,000 (n); \$28,805 (n)
- Texas Transportation Institute, \$33,500 (n)
- University of Arizona, \$75,000
- University of Washington (UW), 38 projects (14 new) totaling \$6,097,331
- Washington State University (WSU), 7 projects (2 new) totaling \$2,335,421
- Western Washington University, \$30,000 (n)
- USDOT, Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, \$68,000 (n)

Letter (n) stands for **new** contracts.

3. Summarize actions taken to encourage minority universities to participate on transportation research projects. How many were contracted? Dollar amount?

For this reporting period there are no minority universities contracted to provide transportation research. The Research Office has looked into acquiring services from universities beyond those currently in use but has run into a couple of issues. First, there are only two public research universities in the State of Washington (UW and WSU) neither of which is a minority university. Secondly, many of the private universities in the state are not allowed to compete against private sector organizations for research contracts. These issues make it difficult to pursue the use of minority universities. It is difficult to consider universities from out of state based on the need for interaction between the researcher and the research customer. In those cases where we have gone out of state it was because the researcher was originally here and then took a position with another university and to get the project finished we contracted with the new university that employed the researcher or because a unique expertise was not available within our state.

4. Summarize actions taken to encourage universities to use minority, female, and low-income students to participate on transportation research projects. Please provide a breakdown with the number of minority, female and low-income students participating in such projects.

Listed in the table below is the breakdown of the race and gender for individuals participating in WSDOT's research projects.

The greatest number of students, faculty and staff from a university providing transportation research by contract to WSDOT is the University of Washington (UW). The UW has two programs with the goal of bringing under-represented groups into the field of transportation research. Minority Science and Engineering Program (MSEP) is a program provided by the UW College of Engineering to assist African American, Hispanic American and Native American students. There are no special efforts to attract Asian Pacific Americans into the Engineering programs as there is not under representation of this ethnic group in such programs.

MSEP has 11 subprograms that deal with various aspects of the university environment including student internship, financial assistance, workshops for pre-university schools and more. The other program available at the UW is Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) Professional Mentoring Program which facilitates the personal and career development of women in engineering and the sciences through relationships with role models in their respective fields.

Participation in Transportation Research	Faculty/ Staff		Students		TOTAL
Race	Male	Female	Male	Female	
African – American	0	1	0	2	3
Asian-American	13	6	16	14	49
Caucasian	99	42	46	48	235
Hispanic	1	0	1	0	2
Native American	0	0	0	0	0
Subcontinent Asian	1	0	10	1	12
Other	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	114	49	73	66	302

5. Provide a summary of Title VI self-monitoring activities conducted, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.

There have been no self-monitoring activities for this reporting period. The Research Office will meet with the Department's Title VI Coordinator to find mechanisms for self-monitoring in Title VI compliance. This discussion will become part of the quarterly meetings with the Title VI Coordinator.

6. Were any civil rights complaints received regarding non-utilization of minority universities for research studies? If so, how many? Summarize each complaint and the status, with actions proposed and taken.

No; there have been no complaints in the Research Program.

7. What Title VI training was provided within your program?

None.

8. What Title VI training was attended by your program personnel?

Tom Hanson, Research Program Administrator, attended discussion sessions held by the WSDOT OEO to discuss the annual report and methods of data gathering on minority participation.

9. List any significant problem areas and corrective actions taken.

No problem areas were found.

10. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.

Almost all of the projects planned for the 03-05 biennium are under contract. The projects for the 05-07 biennium are in the process of being selected. It is the 05-07 projects that will be examined for potential contracts with minority universities or consulting firms.

11. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of your staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and female staff?

- Research Director, female, Caucasian
- Research Project Managers, 3 male, 2 female, all Caucasian
- Secretary, female, African-American
- Librarian, female, Caucasian
- Library Assistant, male, Caucasian

There were two vacancies in the Research staff during the reporting period. The vacancies were filled with an African American female and a Caucasian male. The hiring process was conducted according to the Department's Affirmative Action policies and procedures.

H. CONSULTANT CONTRACTING

- 1. For the special emphasis program areas listed below, identify how many consultant projects were awarded during the reporting period? Dollar value of each contract? How many of these contracts are held by minority and/or women owned firms? Dollar value of each contract? (Break out by special emphasis program areas.)**

- Planning
- Design
- Right of Way
- Research
- Training
- Construction/Maintenance
- Environmental

Please see Attachment 4 for information on Consultant Contracts for the above-listed programs.

- 2. What efforts were made to increase minority and female participation in obtaining consultant contracts? Is there currently a separate list maintained on minority and woman consultants? How many firms are included on the list?**

HQ CSO sought to increase D/M/WBE contract participation by providing outreach for these companies during workshops and vendor symposiums associated with small business programs as well as D/M/WBE business programs.

WSDOT does not maintain a separate list of D/M/WBE certified firms because there is currently a D/M/WBE database on the OMWBE web page that has a listing of all firms currently certified as D/M/WBE firms.

3. Were any civil rights complaints received regarding non-utilization of minority/women firms? If so, how many? Summarize each complaint and the status, with actions proposed and taken.

No complaints were received during the reporting period.

4. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of employees, working within the Department of Transportation's Consultant Services Office. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and female staff?

Consultant Services Office Staff

Director of Consultant Services (WMS3) - Caucasian Male

Assistant Director of Consultant Services (WMS2) - Caucasian Male

Assistant Director of Consultant Services (WMS2) - Caucasian Male

Liaison for Consultant Programs (TE3) - Caucasian Female

Liaison for Consultant Programs (TE3) - Caucasian Male

Records and Documentation Tech. (TT2) - Caucasian Female

Records and Documentation Tech. (TT2) - Caucasian Female

There were two new positions created in CSO during the reporting period. The hiring for those positions was conducted based on the Department's Affirmative Action Policies and Procedures.

I. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. During the reporting period, what efforts were made to encourage participation by minorities and women in NHI's educational and training program?

No special Department-wide efforts were made to encourage women or minority participation in NHI training during the reporting period. WSDOT's Title VI Coordinator will discuss possible strategies with the Education and Training Title VI Liaison

2. List the types of NHI sponsored or co-sponsored programs. How many state participants? How many minorities and women? Status of completion.

WSDOT is an active participant in courses offered through the National Highway Institute subsidized by FHWA.

During the reporting period, WSDOT employees attended five FHWA training sessions as follows:

COURSE TITLE	DATE	COURSE CODE
NHI: NEPA & Trans Decision Making (142005A)	10/7-9/03	A61 1108
NHI: GTC Soils & Foundations Workshop (132012)	10/27-31/03	AY7 1105
ENV: Hwy Traffic Noise Analysis & Abatement Workshop (FHWA)	12/10-11/03	CLW 1101
GTC: -G.F.E. Rock Slopes (132035)	1/21-22/04	BZ4 1103
NHI: Gen-Application of the FHWA Traffic Monitoring Guide (151018A)	4/20-21/04	CMJ 1101

FY	No. of Classes	No. of Attendees	No. of women		No. of Minorities	
2004	5	70	21	30%	9	13%

3. Identify staff responsible for training by job title, ethnicity and sex.

WSDOT Training Personnel		
Job Title	Ethnicity	Gender
HRC3 – Training Coordinator	Caucasian	F
OEO Trainer	African-American	F
Maint Trainer	Caucasian	M
Construction Trainer	Caucasian	M
Safety Trainer	Caucasian	M
Safety Trainer	Caucasian	F
CAE Trainer	Caucasian	M

Driver's Trainer/IRT	Caucasian	M
Design Trainer	Caucasian	M
Purchasing Trainer	Caucasian	F
Communications Trainer	Caucasian	F
Financial Svcs. Trainer	Asian	M
CAE Trainer	Caucasian	M
Administrative Officer	Caucasian	F
Construction Trainer	American-Indian	M
Maint Trainer	American-Indian	M
HRCA	Caucasian	F
Safety Trainer	Caucasian	M
Administrative Officer	Caucasian	M
CADD Trainer	Caucasian	F
CaiCE Trainer	Caucasian	M
Construction Trainer	Caucasian	M
Maint Trainer	Caucasian	M
Safety Trainer	Caucasian	M
Safety Manager	African-American	M
Safety Officer Asst	Caucasian	F
Design Trainer	Asian	F
Administrative Officer	Caucasian	M
Construction Trainer	Caucasian	M
Safety Trainer	Hispanic	M
Maint Trainer	Caucasian	M
Regional Administrative Officer	Caucasian	F
Safety Manager	Caucasian	M
Safety Trainer	Caucasian	M
OEO Trainer	Caucasian	F
HRC3 – Training Coordinator	Caucasian	F
HRC1 – Training Coordinator	Caucasian	F
Construction Trainer	Caucasian	M
Design Trainer	Caucasian	M
CADD Trainer	Caucasian	M
Maintenance Trainer	Caucasian	M
Financial Services Trainer	Caucasian	F
IT Trainer	Caucasian	M
Survey Trainer	Caucasian	M
Environmental Trainer	Caucasian	M
Traffic Trainer	Caucasian	M
Administrative Officer	African-American	M
IT Trainer	Korean	M
Construction Trainer	Caucasian	F
Safety & Health Trainer	American-Indian	M
Development Trainer	Caucasian	M

Maint Trainer	Caucasian	M
HRC1 (T2 Center)	Caucasian	F
HRCA (T2 Center)	Caucasian	F
Design Trainer	Caucasian	M
Construction Trainer Coordinator	Caucasian	F
Design Trainer	Caucasian	M
Design Trainer Coordinator	Caucasian	F
Design/Hydraulic Trainer	Mexican	F
Env Training Coordinator	Caucasian	F
Env Trainer	Caucasian	M
Env Trainer	Caucasian	M
Survey Trainer & Support	Caucasian	M
Traffic Trainer	American-Indian	M
Traffic Trainer	Caucasian	M
GPS Trainer	Caucasian	M
HRCA	Caucasian	F
HRCA	Caucasian	F
HRC2	Caucasian	F
HRC4	Caucasian	F
PO5	Caucasian	F
Asst HR Dir	African-American	F
HRC4	Caucasian	M
HRC3	Caucasian	F
HRC3	Caucasian	F
Photo Tech 2	Caucasian	M
Cont Agree Mgt	Caucasian	M
Director of Org Strategy & HR Dev	Caucasian	M
Training Manager	Caucasian	M
HRCA2	Hispanic	F
HRC3	Hispanic	M
HRC3	Caucasian	F
HRC3	African-American	M
HRC3	Caucasian	F
HRC3	Caucasian	F
HRC3	African-American	F
HRC3	African-American	F

Staff Development Personnel		
Job Title	Ethnicity	Gender
Human Resources Development Spec 5	Caucasian	M
Human Resources Consultant 4	Caucasian	M
Information Technology Specialist 4	Caucasian	M
Program Manager E4	Caucasian	M

Staff Development Personnel		
Job Title	Ethnicity	Gender
Administrative Assistant	Caucasian	F
Administrative Assistant	Caucasian	F
Human Resources Consultant Assistant	Caucasian	F
Human Resources Consultant 1	Caucasian	M
Human Resources Consultant Assistant	Caucasian	F

A summary of how vacancies were handled for this program area is attached as Attachment 2 & 3.

- 4. Were there any civil rights complaints filed concerning training and educational opportunities? If so, what corrective actions did you take? Provide summary of concerns raised, complaints filed, status, etc.**

No civil rights complaints regarding training have been filed.

5. Indicate how many training contracts were offered by Staff Development in the areas listed below, including the dollar amount for each one of them.

- a. Technical/Professional**
- b. Maintenance**
- c. Employment Development**
- d. Information Technology**
- e. Management**
- f. Safety**

Staff Development Training Contracts

<i>Training Program</i>	Agreement #	Vendor	Beg Date	End Date	Amount
Tech/Prof	Y8969	CH2M Hill	6/17/04	6/10/06	\$105,900
Employee Dev	Y8954	The Burgess Consortium	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$67,218
	Y8955	Bryan & Bryan Assoc	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$99,900
	Y8956	Clover Park Tech College	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$68,744
	Y8957	Knowles & Associates	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$40,599
	Y8958	Nai-Che & Associates	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$272,226
	Y8959	Ruth Johnson	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$203,449
	Y8960	Seattle Training & Consulting	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$36,825
	Y8961	Writewords	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$180,695
	Y8962	Writing Services	5/17/04	5/16/07	\$49,649
Maintenance & Safety	Y8831	Mike Giampietri	10/15/03	10/15/06	\$4,750
	Y8854	Digital Communications	1/1/04	1/1/05	\$4,800

6. Indicate how many of these opportunities went to minority owned - businesses and their dollar amounts, and how many went to women owned businesses and their dollar amounts?

Based on OMWBE list of certified M/WBE and DBE firms, the following certified firms from the above table received training contracts from WSDOT:

- Bryan and Bryan Associates (WBE) - \$ 99,900
- Ruth I. Johnson (WBE/DBE) - \$203,449

7. What efforts were made to improve minority and/or women participation in these contracts whenever their participation was found low or nonexistent? Please explain.

All requests for proposals with contract amounts over \$20K are advertised in the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce. All requests for proposals contain statements that Training Agreements will be awarded and administered in full compliance with Washington State Civil Rights laws and policies; and that the Department encourages minority and women-owned organizations and enterprises to respond.

During the upcoming year the Staff Development Office will meet with the Title VI Coordinator to discuss the existing strategies to attract and contract minority and women owned training firms to determine whether they promote equal participation in the Department's training contracts. New strategies may be implemented as a result of these discussions to ensure our training opportunities are available to all qualified firms including minority and women owned ones.

VI. WASHINGTON STATE FERRIES

This section will be addressed during the FY05 reporting period as more coordination is needed to establish an effective Title VI data collection within all the program areas in WSF.

A. TERMINAL DESIGN

- 1. How are Title VI considerations addressed through stakeholder involvement mechanisms?**
- 2. Describe how minorities, women and low-income populations were provided opportunities to be involved in public consultation regarding terminal design.**
- 3. Describe the mechanisms used to identify what populations (minorities, women and low-income) were represented in the project selection processes.**
- 4. Describe what project selection decisions if any, were affected by Title VI or Environmental Justice issues?**
- 5. Provide a summary of Title VI self-monitoring activities conducted, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.**
- 6. What Title VI training was provided within your program?**
- 7. What Title VI training was attended by you program personnel?**
- 8. List any significant problem areas and corrective actions taken.**
- 9. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.**
- 10. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of your staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase minority and female recruitment?**
- 11. Has your program received any civil rights complaints? If so, was any corrective action needed? What corrective action did your program take?**

B. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

- 1. During the reporting period, what efforts were made to encourage participation by minorities and women in NHI's educational and training program?**
- 2. List the types of NHI sponsored or co-sponsored programs. How many WSF participants? How many minorities and women? Status of completion.**
- 3. Identify the WSF staff responsible for training by job title, ethnicity and sex.**
- 4. Were there any civil rights complaints filed concerning training and educational opportunities? If so, what corrective actions has the WSF taken? Provide summary of concerns raised, complaints filed, status, etc.**

C. TERMINAL CONSTRUCTION

- 1. How many terminal construction projects were initiated in this reporting period?**
- 2. Of these projects, how many had mitigation measures?**
- 3. Identify how many mitigation measures had Title VI implications. For each mitigation measure having Title VI implications, briefly describe what was mitigated.**
- 4. How many contract change orders had Title VI implications during this reporting period? Briefly describe how the implications were resolved.**
- 5. How many public meetings were held to keep communities informed of projects? Were minorities, women and low-income populations represented at these meetings?**
- 6. Describe the mechanisms you used to identify what communities (minorities, women and low-income) were represented at these meetings.**
- 7. Describe the efforts made to invite minorities, women and low-income communities to the meetings.**

- 8. Provide a summary of Title VI self-monitoring activities conducted, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.**
- 9. What Title VI training was provided within your program?**
- 10. What Title VI training was attended by you program personnel?**
- 11. List any significant problem areas and corrective actions taken.**
- 12. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.**
- 13. Has your program received any civil rights complaints involving competitive bidding procedures? If so, was any corrective action needed, what corrective action did the Department take? (Provide summary of any concerns raised by minority or women owned firms concerning licensing, lack of subcontracting opportunities, etc.)**
- 14. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender your program's staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and female employees?**

C. TERMINAL MAINTENANCE

- 1. How many terminal maintenance projects were initiated in this reporting period?**
- 2. How many contract change orders had Title VI implications during this reporting period? Briefly describe how the implications were resolved.**
- 3. How many public meetings were held to keep communities informed of projects? Were minorities, women and low-income populations represented at these meetings?**
- 4. Describe the efforts made to invite minorities, women and low-income communities to the meetings.**
- 5. During the review period, were any procedures reviewed to assure nondiscrimination in subcontract agreements, first and second tier, material supply and equipment lease agreements?**

- 6. How many maintenance contracts were issued during the reporting period? Dollar amount? How many of those went to a minority or women owned business? Dollar amount?**
- 7. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of your staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and female staff?**
- 8. Has your program received any civil rights complaints involving competitive bidding procedures? If so, was any corrective action needed, what corrective action did the Department take? (Provide summary of any concerns raised by minority and women owned firms concerning licensing, lack of subcontracting opportunity, etc.)**

D. VESSEL MAINTENANCE

- 1. How many vessel maintenance projects were initiated in this reporting period?**
- 2. How many contract change orders had Title VI implications during this reporting period? Briefly describe how the implications were resolved.**
- 3. How many public meetings were held to keep communities informed of projects? Were minorities, women and low-income populations represented at these meetings?**
- 4. Describe the efforts made to invite minorities, women and low-income communities to the meetings.**
- 5. During the review period, were any procedures reviewed to assure nondiscrimination in subcontract agreements, first and second tier, material supply and equipment lease agreements?**
- 6. How many vessel maintenance contracts were issued during the reporting period? Dollar amount? How many of those went to a minority or women owned business? Dollar amount?**
- 7. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of your staff. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the recruitment of minority and female staff?**
- 8. Has your program received any civil rights complaints involving competitive bidding procedures? If so, was any corrective action**

needed, what corrective action did WSF take? (Provide summary of any concerns raised by minority and women owned firms concerning licensing, lack of subcontracting opportunities, etc.)

E. PLANNING

- 1. What activities and/or studies were conducted that provided data relative to minority persons, neighborhoods, income levels, physical environment and travel habits? Please list each activity or study and include a very brief statement about the activity or study and how it was/will be used.**
- 2. Were there any opportunities to assess special language needs in a community served by the Transportation Planning Office during the reporting period? If so, were those language needs properly addressed through language resources? Explain.**
- 3. Identify the number of public meetings and hearings held during the reporting period. What efforts did you use to ensure citizen participation in the public meetings and hearings, particularly minorities, women and low-income? Were minorities, women and low-income citizens, both individually and through their organizations, represented in the citizen participation effort? How many and in what capacity?**
- 4. Describe the mechanisms used to identify what communities (minorities, women and low-income) were represented at these public meetings and hearings. Was data on minority, women and low-income attendees collected in those meetings? Explain the methodology used to collect the data. Was the data analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the outreach to include Title VI protected groups into the public consultation process? What was the outcome?**
- 5. Provide a summary of Title VI compliance self-monitoring activities conducted, including findings, recommendations, action items and status thereof.**
- 6. What Title VI training was provided within your program?**
- 7. What Title VI training was attended by program staff?**
- 8. List any significant problem areas and corrective actions taken.**

- 9. List goals/actions planned for the ensuing year.**
- 10. Were any civil rights complaints received as a result of WSF's planning process e.g., public involvement activities, lack of coordination with Indian tribal governments, contracting opportunities for planning studies or corridor studies? If so, how many? Summarize each complaint and the status, with actions proposed and taken.**
- 11. Please provide the titles, ethnicity and gender of employees, by program, working within WSF. Were there any vacancies during the reporting period? What efforts were made to increase the minority and female representation in your staff?**

ANNUAL WORK PLAN FOR FY05

1. Provide technical support to local agencies regarding the Title VI Chapter on WSDOT's LAG Manual. This will take place throughout FY05.
2. Initiate LAG Manual Title VI Training series for local agencies through T-2 Center. This is projected to take place in May 2005.
3. Continue coordinating the review of Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) with the Environmental Services Office to ensure compliance with Title VI and Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice. This will take place throughout FY05.
4. Continue to coordinate efforts with the Communications, Transportation Planning, Environmental Services Offices, WSF and other program areas involved in WSDOT's communication to develop a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) compliance process and incorporate as part of the existing Title VI Plan. This effort will take place by May 2005.
5. Continue meeting with local agencies' Title VI Coordinators twice a year to exchange program information, best practices, court cases and new Title VI legal interpretations. Meetings will take place in April and October of 2005.
6. Revise the Title VI Plan to incorporate compliance information for Maintenance operations. This effort will be accomplished by April 2005.
7. Continue conducting quarterly meetings with the Special Emphasis Program Area Title VI Liaisons to monitor program implementation, receive feedback and provide training and technical assistance to them on the newly revised Title VI Update Report Questionnaire. This will take place throughout FY05.
8. Continue addressing Title VI complaints either through formal investigations or early resolution. This will take place throughout FY05.
9. Annual Accomplishment Report for FY06. This will take place by November 7, 2005.
10. Establish work plan for FY06. This will be accomplished by November 7, 2005.
11. Revise WSDOT's Title VI brochure to incorporate information on Maintenance activities and the CRRA and LEP provisions. Translate the brochure into the Spanish language. This task will be completed by March 2005.

12. Continue reviewing Title VI compliance documents (Title VI Plans, Nondiscrimination Agreements and Title VI Update Reports) from sub recipients and recommend approval to the ECRB Manager. This will take place throughout CY05.